



ATTACHMENT A Remarks

Claims 1-28 stand pending in the present application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 10, 13 and 17 have been amended and new claims 27 and 28 have been added. It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action the specification has been objected to because "the set of Claims in pages 14-18 fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(i)." Clarification of the objection under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(i) is respectfully requested. In Applicant's copy of the claims, the claims appear on pages 16-22 and appear to be in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(i) with respect to line indentation.

Claims 1-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. One aspect of this rejection concerns the use of the term "unknown". It is respectfully submitted that the term "unknown" is defined on page 9 in the specification as filed as a device not identified or only partially identified by the operating system. Further, an "unknown" device is further defined as a device in which the drivers have not been installed, have only partially been installed or for which more appropriate or specific drivers are available that need to be installed, e.g., for which a generic driver exists in the system but a more specific driver is available for the device (see, e.g., page 9, lines 2-12).

However, in order to more clearly recite what is intended by the term "unknown," claim 1 has been amended to replace the term "unknown" with a definition thereof taken from in the specification, namely a device not properly identified by the system, and claims 6, 10 and 13 have been similarly amended. It is respectfully submitted that the

amendments to the claims does not constitute “new matter” and that the amendment obviates the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In addition, claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for reciting “USB.” The abbreviation “USB” has been deleted thereby obviating the rejection.

Claim 10 has been rejected because “the incorporation of the claimed preamble ‘wherein the instructions when executed comprises’ and the body of the claim is unclear.” By this Amendment, claim 10 has been amended to use more consistent “Beauregard” claim language in accordance with *In re Beauregard*, 53 F.3d 1585 (Fed. Cir. 1995). Specifically, claim 10 now recites a “computer program in a computer readable medium, said program comprising instructions when executed for: . . .” Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 as amended is in accordance with *In re Beauregard* and not “indefinite” wherein the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 13 was rejected on similar grounds to claim 10. By this Amendment, claim 13 has been amended to more clearly recite that, in accordance with *In re Beauregard*, the storage device comprises executable instruction which when executed performs the recited functions. Thus, in accordance with the decision in *In re Beauregard*, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 as amended is not indefinite.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are now in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. It is alleged that claim 1, when broadly interpreted, “does not provide a practical result but acts like manipulating an idea.”

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 does recite a method that produces a “useful, concrete and tangible result.” As recited in the claim (and described in the specification as filed), the present method provides the tangible result of removing the entry of an “unknown” device from the configuration data. As a result, of the claimed method the device is removed from the configuration data of the computer system. Consequently, the functionality of the computer system is modified by the claimed method. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed method produces a useful, concrete and tangible result, namely modifying the computer system by removal of the device from the configuration data, and thus that the claimed method provides a “practical result” and does not simply provide for manipulation of an idea. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being “anticipated by” the Garms et al patent (hereinafter “Garms”).

It is respectfully submitted that Garms is directed to a “Windows NT Server 4” instructional guide which provides a computer user with information on how to manually configure a Windows NT server and Windows NT computer network. For example, Garms provides instruction for a computer user to manually search the computer system’s configuration data and registry for peripheral devices attached to the computer system.

The present method, system and apparatus are concerned with removing devices not properly identified by the system so that a subsequent installation of the device will not conflict with any prior partial, incomplete, or generic identification of the now removed device. The result of the present method and system is the elimination of previously installed entry data for a not properly identified device, e.g., a device which is not completely recognized or recognized as being generic, so as to not conflict with a reinstallation or subsequent installation of that previously not properly identified device.

With regard to claim 1, the claimed method includes searching the configuration data for entry of a device not properly identified by the system and removing the entry for the device from the configuration data. Garms does not teach or suggest searching configuration data for a device not properly identified by the system. Although it is alleged in the Office Action that one *could* use a computer system to search configuration data for entry of a device not properly identified, Garms fails to teach or suggest conducting such a search, let alone provide any motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to conduct such a search. Thus, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Garms discloses how one could conduct a search, the combination of searching the configuration data and removing the entry for the device as recited in claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Garms. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and dependent claims 2-5 dependent therefrom are not anticipated by Garms under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

With regard to claim 6, Garms fails to teach or suggest searching a registry for a universal serial bus (USB) printer which is not properly identified and removing entry of that printer from the registry as claimed. As discussed above with respect to the

rejection of claim 1, even assuming *arguendo*, that Garms discloses how one might conduct a registry search for removing a printer which is not properly identified and removing its entry from the registry, Garms fails to teach or suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art that one is to conduct a search of the registry for a printer which is not identified by the system and then remove the entry of that printer from the registry, as claimed. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to conduct the claimed search to remove the entry for the printer as claimed, absent the present disclosure. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6-9 are not obvious in view of Garms.

With regard to claim 10, Garms fails to teach or suggest the claimed executable medium which comprises an executable program for performing the recited specific steps of deleting entries in the configuration file for all devices not properly identified, scanning subkeys in the configuration file for a device entry associated with a selected vendor and removing keys from the configuration file. Even if it is accepted that Garms discloses that the individual steps could be possible, Garms fails to teach or suggest the specific combination of recited steps in order to remove entries in a configuration file, scanning the subkeys and removing keys from the configuration file, all as claimed. Thus, although one of ordinary skill in the art *could* conduct the recited steps, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to perform the combination of recited steps absent the present disclosure.

Further, in order to more clearly to define the embodiment of the present invention as claimed therein, claim 10 has been amended to recite that removing of keys from the configuration file is conducted without a user manually deleting the keys.

The latter is the method that the Office Action alleges Garms discloses. Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 10-12 are not anticipated by Garms.

With regard to claim 13, similarly to claim 10, Garms fails to teach or suggest the claimed recitation of steps for detecting devices connected to a computer, including identifying attached devices as unknown when drivers for the attached devices are not present, installing device drivers, and deleting entries in a configuration file without a user manually deleting entries for all devices which are not properly identified.

With regard to the rejection of claim 17, and dependent claims 18-24 which depend therefrom, it is respectfully submitted that Garms fails to teach or suggest an apparatus including means for removing a registry key associated with a predetermined device of a computer system without a user manually searching for the registry key or means for modifying the configuration file to indicate removal of the predetermined device from the computer system without a user manually modifying the configuration file. Although it is alleged in the Office Action that Garms teaches how a user might remove a registration key and modify the configuration file in a Windows NT server environment, Garms fails to teach or suggest removing a registry key or modifying the configuration file without a user doing the actual steps of manually modifying the registry key and a user manually modifying the configuration file. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 17-24 are not anticipated by Garms.

In order to provide further protection for the invention, new claims 27 and 28 have been added which are dependent on claims 1 and 6, respectively, and which recite that the claimed searching steps are conducted by the executable computer code without a user manually searching the configuration data or the registry. As discussed

above with regard to the rejection of claims 10 and 13, Garms fails to disclose searching configuration data or registry data and removing configuration data or registry data without a user doing the tasks manually.

Finally, new claims 29, 30, 31 and 32 have been added which expand upon the definition of “not properly identified.” For example, claim 29 recites that the device is considered to be not properly identified when the device is: (i) not identified by the system, or (ii) not completely recognized by the system, or (iii) only identified as being a generic device. Claims 30, 31 and 32, which depend from claims 6, 10 and 13, respectively, are similar.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are patentable over the prior art cited and that the present application is now in condition for allowance.

END REMARKS